

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 12, 14 and 16-20 remain pending in this application. No claims have been canceled or added.

Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor for conducting an interview with the undersigned on August 4, 2010. The following includes the substance of that which was discussed during the interview.

Claim Amendments

The Examiner's Supervisor suggested changing the phrase "one or more images from the counterfeit bank note" to "one or more subsequent images from the counterfeit bank note" in order to clarify claim 1. This has been done. Claim 2 has been amended to be consistent with the language of claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0059098) in view of Jones et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0153408). Claims 3 and 19 stand rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al ('098) in view of Jones et al ('408) and further in view of Onishi et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0136457). These rejections are traversed as follows.

Claim 1 is directed to:

An automatic teller machine (ATM) electronically connected to one or more devices, the one or more devices comprising:
a deposit device configured to receive an initial bank note and, subsequently, a counterfeit bank note which is physically the same bank note after having been identified as a counterfeit bank note at an external station;
an image extraction device configured to extract one or more initial images from the initial bank note and one or more subsequent images from the counterfeit bank note;
a transaction log device configured to attach a transaction log to the one or more initial images of the initial bank note;
a comparison device configured to compare the one or initial images of the initial bank note to the one or more subsequent images of the counterfeit bank note in order to obtain a comparison result, the comparison device being configured to calculate values indicating a degree of similarity between the initial bank note and the counterfeit bank note as said comparison result; and
a retrieval device for tracing the counterfeit bank note, which is configured to retrieve the transaction log attached to the initial bank note, if comparison device determines that the one or more initial images of the initial bank note are within a range of similarity to the one or more subsequent images of the counterfeit bank note.

Therefore, according to the presently claimed invention, an ATM has an image extraction device that extracts initial images from an initial bank note. Once the initial bank note is identified as being counterfeit at an external station, the same image extraction device of the ATM extracts one or more images from the counterfeit bank note, which is the same as the initial bank note. Then the two sets of images are compared to determine a degree of similarity.

Jones et al (2003/0059098 (Jones et al '098)) merely disclose that an extracted serial number from a bill is compared with a serial number in a list (see Fig. 3a, steps 212-230). Jones et al '098 also generally refer to other counterfeit tests but do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention (see Fig. 3a, step 245 and [0060]).

Furthermore, the Examiner indicates on page 4, lines 7-12 of the Office Action that Jones et al '098 "discloses a method for tracing counterfeit money that includes the step of retrieving the initial transaction log based on the comparison result, if the comparison result indicates that the one or more initial images of the initial bank note and the one or more images of the counterfeit bank note are within a range of similarity (see [p][0005]) to one or more subsequent images of the counterfeit bank note." However, no such disclosure is found in par. [0005] of Jones et al '098.

Jones et al (2004/0153408 (Jones et al '408)) is referred to in the Office Action, but it is not clear how this reference is relied upon. Jones et al '408 is directed to a financial document processing system that is not believed to be relevant to the claimed invention.

Onishi et al (2002/0136457 (Onishi et al '457)) disclose an apparatus for searching corresponding points between an input image and a reference image and calculating a normalized correlation coefficient (see [0045] and [0048]). Onishi et al '457 fail to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies in Jones et al. '098 and '408.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any shortage of fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, or credit any overpayment of fees, to Deposit Account 50-1417.

MATTINGLY & MALUR, P.C.

By /Shrinath Malur/
Shrinath Malur, Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120